X. — *Elision and Hiatus in Latin Prose and Verse*

By Professor EDGAR H. STURTEVANT, Columbia University,

AND

Professor ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania [1]

I

1. It has come to be familiar doctrine that the elision which we have to observe in reading Latin verse really belonged as well to the pronunciation of prose. Aside from the very great probability that so striking and so common a feature of Latin poetry was not wholly artificial, there are four chief reasons for the current opinion. In the first place, elision is most common in precisely that kind of poetry which approaches most nearly the language of every-day life, namely, comedy; Plautus has over 150 elisions or semi-elisions to 100 lines, while Ennius, his contemporary, has only 22 elisions to 100 lines in the fragments amounting to two or more lines each (179 lines in all; ed. Vahlen.[2] Cf. § 20). In the second place, the students of rhythmic prose are agreed that elision rather than hiatus must usually, if not always, be assumed in the clausulae. (See especially Skutsch, *Vollmöller's Jahres-bericht*, v, 74 and references, and Wolff, *Neue Jahrbücher*, *Suppl.* xxvi, 646 ff.) Some scholars feel, however, that in the present state of our knowledge of prose rhythm this evidence should be received with caution. In the third place, there are passages in ancient authors where elision in prose is spoken of in terms that cannot be misunderstood. Several of these will be cited and discussed below.

2. In the fourth place, Latin possesses a considerable number of stereotyped phrases which in time came to be felt and more or less frequently written as single words. Most such

---

[1] Professor Sturtevant is primarily responsible for I, II (except §§ 12 and 13), and III, and Professor Kent for IV and §§ 12 and 13; but both authors have contributed to the writing of many paragraphs. By special request of the editors of the *Classical Journal* this paper has appeared in briefer and more popular form in the June number of that periodical.

phrases, if they contain concurrent vowels, show elision of the final vowel of the first word. A list of these was published by Skutsch in *Philologus*, 1900, 487 = *Kleine Schriften*, 135 f., and it seems worth while to reproduce it here with half a dozen additions and with such explanation as seems necessary :

animadverto, for *animum adverto*, is familiar (an epigraphic occurrence is recorded in *C.I.L.* v, 5050, 25, of 46 A.D.).

animaequitas, *C.I.L.* VI, 11259, 2, stands for *animi aequitas* (cf. Skutsch, *De Nominum Latinorum Compositione*, 16 = *Kleine Schriften*, 9, Diehl, *Neue Jahrbücher, Suppl.* XXV, 211).

animaequus, Eccl., Gl., may be a retrograde derivative of the above (Skutsch, *l.c.*), or of the oblique cases, *anim(i) aequi, anim(o) aequo, anim(um) aequum* (pronounced *animaequi*, etc.).

antea is from *ante ea*.

cauneas, as every one knows, was understood by Crassus as *cav(e) n(e) eas* (Cicero, *Div.* II, 84).

cavaedium, Pliny, *Ep.* II, 17, 5, is the phonetic spelling of *cavum aedium*, Varro, *L.L.* v, 161.

circitor, fairly frequent in inscriptions and elsewhere (see references in the *Thesaurus*), is the agent noun from *circuire*, on which see below (otherwise Stowasser, *Wiener Studien*, XXII, 125). Similarly we have to read *circ(um)itio* with elision in Terence, *And.* 202.

curago stands for *curam ago* in *C.I.L.* III, 3096, 7506 ; VIII, 141, 6 ; XI, 671 ; VI, 6328 (cf. Diehl, *l.c.* 208 ff.).

dom(i)naedius, Augustine, is semantically equivalent to the phrase *dominus aedium*. The accusative *domin(um) aedium* (pronounced *dominaedium*) gave rise to a new nominative *dominaedius* (cf. Skutsch, *l.c.*).

domuitionem, poeta ap. Auct. *ad Herennium*, III, 34, for *domum itionem*, is traditionally spelled with *u*; but the author of the treatise *ad Herennium* suggests *Domitium* as a catch-word to remember the phrase by, and this requires the pronunciation *domitionem*.

domusio, Varro, *Sat. Men.* 223, 4 Riese, Petronius 46, 48, seems to stand for *domi usio* (cf. Pokrowskij, *I.F.* XXVI, 101).

eccum, eccos, etc., come from *ecce *hum, ecce hos*, etc., **hum* being the first element of *hun-c(e)* (cf. Sturtevant on Terence, *Andria*, 532).

eccillum, eccillos, etc., come from *ecce illum*, etc.

identidem is perhaps from *idem ante idem*, with two elisions, or from
    idem tum idem, with one elision, though Walde, *Lat. Etym.
    Wtb.*[2] prefers *idem itidem* (Lindsay-Nohl, 658) or *idem et
    idem*.

magnopere for *magno opere* is familiar.   Here we may mention
    maximopere, tantopere, quantopere, and *summopere*.

necopinans, necopinatus, and *necopinus* come from *neque opinans*, etc.,
    although the use of *c* instead of *qu* must be due to the influence
    of anteconsonantal *nec*.

nil may have come directly from *ne hil(om)* by elision, or from *nihil*
    by contraction.

nullus, numquam, nusquam, nutiquam (traditionally spelled *neut-*,
    but with short initial syllable in early poetry) are from *nĕ ullus*,
    etc.   Similarly, early Latin *noenum* is from *nĕ *oenom*, 'not
    one,' however we solve the difficult problem presented by the
    ō of *non*.

potest is from *pote est, poteram* from *pote eram*, etc.

Properoc[ius, Dessau, 8761 = Bruns, *Fontes Iuris,*[7] p. 119, a fictitious
    name, may be based upon the phrase *propere ocius ;* but others,
    on account of the context, think the name is *Properoc[ibius*.

reapse, Terence, *H. T.* 636, Scipio Africanus ap. Festus, 289, Cicero,
    ad Fam. IX, 15, 1, etc., stands for *re eapse = re ipsa*.

saltem is probably from *si *alitem = sin aliter* (see Warren, *T.A.P.A.*
    XXXII, 118 f.).

Septaquis stands for *Septem Aquis*, the name of a town, in *C.I.L.* IX,
    4206, 4207, 4208, 4399 (Diehl, *l.c.* 210).

sodes is for *si audes*.

veneo is from *venum eo*.[2]

3.   In addition, there are several very common idiomatic
phrases, such as *tametsi, quemadmodum, quamobrem*, and
antehac, which the poets would scarcely venture to use in
any but their familiar form, and which regularly show elision
in verse.   We may mention also the loss of final vowels in
such words as *nec, haec, animal, vin* (for *visne*), etc.   It is
usual to ascribe these forms to syncope before an initial con-

---

[2] The loss of the second of two concurrent vowels, as in *ellum* for *em illum*
and *amatast* for *amata est*, was confined within narrow limits, and is not consid-
ered in this paper in parts I, II, and III.

sonant of the next word, but it is extremely probable that eli-
sion before an initial vowel was also a factor.   At any rate,
elision is more probable than syncope as the cause of the loss
of final *-um* in *nihil : nihilum*, and *non : noenum*.

4. Elision, then, was a fairly common feature not only of
artistic Latin prose, but also of every-day speech.   Neverthe-
less, it does not follow that elision was as nearly universal in
prose as it was in poetry.   In fact, some peculiarities of eli-
sion in poetry obviously cannot reflect the usage of ordinary
conversation.   The poets not infrequently present elision at
the end of a sentence ; but it would be quite absurd to ascribe
this practice to common speech as well.   The dramatic poets
very often present elision at a change of speakers ; but we
cannot suppose that in real life a Roman could foresee the
reply to his question, so as to treat his final vowel in one way
if the reply was to begin with a vowel, and in a very different
way if it was to begin with a consonant.[3]

5. Our feeling that elision cannot have been usual in prose
at a strong pause in the sense is strengthened when we re-
member that even the poets occasionally admit hiatus in such
a position.   A still stronger argument is furnished by the
almost universal preference of hiatus to elision at the close
of the verse ; for, as far as form is concerned, the verse is to
poetry what the sentence is to prose.   Hiatus is further per-
mitted at the main caesura or diaeresis in most types of verse,
and this would seem to indicate that elision did not occur in
prose at minor pauses.   Since the direct evidence on prose
usage which we considered above applies only to concurrent
vowels within a phrase (the rhythmic clausulae never extend
across a break in the sense), there is no way to determine
just how strong the pause had to be in order to prevent
elision.   In the lack of precise evidence we may suppose
that elision in Latin prose was restricted approximately to
phrases as closely united as those which in modern French

[3] The dramatic poets had one excuse for this procedure : the second speaker
might pronounce his first sound simultaneously with the final vowel of the prior
speaker, which would, from the standpoint of metrical time, give the same result
as actual elision.

present liaison of consonants. (Cf. Abbott, *Classical Weekly*, IV, 98.)

6. Even within the phrase we must not assume that elision was as nearly constant in prose as it was in verse. Hiatus within the phrase is clearly recognized by Quintilian (IX, 4, 33–37). After warning the orator against too frequently allowing *vocalium concursus*, he continues (36): At Demosthenes et Cicero modice respexerunt ad hanc partem. Nam et coeuntes litterae, quae συναλοιφαὶ dicuntur, etiam leviorem faciunt orationem, quam si omnia verba suo fine cluduntur; et nonnunquam hiulca etiam decent faciuntque ampliora quaedam, ut *pulchra oratione acta*. Tum longae per se et velut opimae syllabae aliquid etiam medii temporis inter vocales, quasi intersistatur, assumunt. The contrast between elision (συναλοιφαὶ) and hiatus (*hiulca quaedam*) is illustrated by the phrase *pulchra oratione acta ;* and the reference in the final sentence to long vowels makes it clear that the final vowel of *pulchra* and the initial vowel of *oratione* were both pronounced with their full quantity and with a slight pause (*aliquid medii temporis*) between them.

The parallel passage in Cicero, *Orator*, 150–152, is so much less clear that it would be difficult to understand without the commentary furnished by Quintilian. Only one of Cicero's remarks, however, seems inconsistent with the later author. After speaking of hiatus in certain Greek writers, he says (152): Sed Graeci viderint; nobis ne si cupiamus quidem distrahere voces conceditur. In view of Quintilian's statement that hiatus was proper in the phrase *pulchra oratione acta*, this must mean that ⟨under certain circumstances or in certain types of phrases⟩ the separation of successive words was impossible in Latin, although possible in Greek.

7. It is not surprising, then, to observe that the stereotyped phrases show hiatus in a number of instances, as follows:

circumagi is a quadrisyllable in Horace, *Sat.* I, 9, 16, and doubtless it was so pronounced in prose.

circumeo and its derivatives are frequent in prose and verse and are regularly to be read without elision ; *e.g.*, Plautus, *Curc.* 451, Ita nón potuére uno ánno circumírier. The spelling with-

out *m* (*circuit, circuire, circuitus*) is very common ; *e.g.*, *C.I.L.*
II, 3420.[4]

cura ago for *curam ago* is a common epigraphical spelling (for cita-
tions, see Diehl, *Neue Jahrbücher, Suppl.* xxv, 208 f.), which
seems to indicate pronunciation without elision. Cf. *curago*
in § 2, above.

deinde and *deinceps* (cf. *inceps,* Paul. Fest. 75, 15 Th. d. P.) were
usually pronounced with diphthongs in classical times, but the
two concurrent vowels must originally have been pronounced
separately.

nemo, from **ne hemo*, shows contraction instead of elision, and con-
sequently the phrase must have been trisyllabic at one
time.

neuter, from *ne uter*, is a trisyllable according to Consentius, 389 K. :
Si aliquis dicat *neutrum* disyllabum, quod trisyllabum enunti-
amus, barbarismum faciet.   Apparently the only place which
requires the dissyllabic pronunciation is *Ciris*, 68 : Sive est
neutra parens atque hoc in carmine toto, — where Vollmer un-
necessarily emends to *Sive necutra.* We may pronounce *neu-
tra* with a diphthong or *nut-ra* with elision and length by
position.   The common spelling of *neutiquam* indicates either
a tetrasyllabic pronunciation or diphthongal *eu.*

nihil and *nihilum*, from **ne hilum*, show assimilation of the first
vowel to the second.

proinde, like *deinde*, must at one time have been a trisyllable. *Proin*
has to be read as a dissyllable in *Priap.* 85, 16.

prout seems not to occur in verse ; its spelling would indicate a
dissyllabic pronunciation.

quemadmodum shows elision of the first vowel in the poets ; but
a fuller pronunciation is indicated by epigraphical *queadmo-
dum, C.I.L.* II, 5439, iv (2), 14, 18 ; vi, 8861, 2 ; x, 5670 b, 12
(Diehl, *l.c.* 210).

quoad is monosyllabic in Lucretius, II, 850, and Horace, *Sat.* II, 3,
91, but its spelling seems to indicate a fuller pronunciation.

quousque seems also to show hiatus.

The future infinitive passive often ends in *-tuiri* (*datuiri, sublatuiri,*
etc.) in late Latin (see Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre,*[3] III, 177,
Weirich, *A.L.L.* x, 136 and references).

---

[4] For the varying treatment of some other compound verbs, see Klotz, *Alt-
römische Metrik,* 139 f.

8. The different treatment of *ne* in *nĕ-ŭter* and *numquam* (from **nĕ-úmquam*) has sometimes been thought to be due to the difference in the position of the accent (see references in Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*,[2] 291). Sommer seems inclined to extend the same principle to other stereotyped phrases. There is really no clear evidence in favor of the theory, and it does not seem to account for such pairs as *circuitus* : *circitor*, *cura ago* : *curago*, and *queadmodum* : *qu(em) ad modum*. The evidence does not enable us to decide under precisely what circumstances elision within the phrase took place. We may surmise that elision was more frequent in rapid utterance than in deliberate speech, and Quintilian tells us that hiatus was sometimes preferred for the sake of emphasis. It is likely that considerations of rhythm had some bearing upon the question. It might be supposed, furthermore, that some combinations of vowels would be more prone to elision than others, and the stereotyped phrases *proinde*, *prout*, *quoad*, and *quousque* may indicate that long *o* tended to remain before a dissimilar vowel (contrast *magnopere*, *tantopere*, etc.). That we cannot apply here the rules for contraction or hiatus in the interior of a word is shown by the different quantitative results of elision and contraction.

II

9. Recent publications on Latin grammar are almost as unanimous in regard to the character of elision as they are in regard to its prevalence in prose as well as in verse. The only exception which we have noticed is Lindsay, *Short Historical Latin Grammar*,[2] 16. It is usually assumed that elided vowels were not entirely suppressed, but were merely so far reduced that they occupied no appreciable time. This is the opinion, for example, of Klotz, *Altrömische Metrik*, 195, although he admits that there is no proof of his doctrine. The most recent statement of the case is in Sommer, *l.c.*

10. This opinion is based chiefly upon a widespread conviction that the total suppression of elided vowels would obscure the meaning of Latin poetry. In particular, many

scholars rebel against the traditional " total elision " in early
dramatic verse of such words as *i* 'they,' *i* 'go,' and the deic-
tic particle *em*.   There is, however, an easy alternative in the
semi-elision or prosodic hiatus which all scholars assume in
such phrases as *quĭ ămānt, cŭm ĕō*, etc.   Perhaps some may
hesitate to push this method of reading so far as Lindsay
does, who says (*The Captivi of Plautus*, 49): " Perhaps the
best plan to follow will be to suppose prosodic hiatus where
there would be any stress on the word "; but surely all will
prefer to read, for example, *i ĭn malám crucém* rather than
(*i*) *ĭn malám crucém* with elision.[5]   Even if we assume that
an elided *i* was still audible, it is unsatisfactory to transfer
the verse ictus from the imperative to the unemphatic prepo-
sition.   It is quite unlikely that monosyllables consisting
wholly of a vowel or of a vowel followed by *m* ever suffered
elision.   We are convinced that after other monosyllables
also semi-elision was more common in early dramatic verse
than many scholars yet recognize; for instance, complete
elision of an emphatic and repeated *iam* (as in *Andria*, 704
and *Phormio*, 559) is surely wrong.   In later poetry this fea-
ture is less prominent, but the elision of monosyllables is
largely avoided by other means.

Perhaps a diligent search would discover a few passages
which would really be made ambiguous by the complete loss
of elided vowels; for every language tolerates occasional
ambiguity.   The writers, however, do not know of any such
passage.   Sommer (*l.c.*) cites Lucilius, 358 and 370; but
Kent, *A.J.P.* xxxII, 275, has shown that we must read *e* in
line 358 with semi-elision, and (*op. cit.* 275, 283) he has shown
that Marx's text of line 370 is wrong.

11.   In any case there is reason for thinking that the
Romans must have been able to dispense with some of their
inflectional tags.   In all languages the hearer, as a rule,
receives through the ear only a part of the sounds produced
by the speaker, and supplies the rest of them from his knowl-
edge of the situation and of the language spoken.   It is for

---

[5] *Ĭn malám crucém*, with crasis, would also be intelligible to the hearer, and
such a pronunciation may have occurred, especially in rapid utterance.

this reason that we understand a sentence more readily than
we do a list of unrelated words or an unfamiliar name.   Since
Latin inflectional syllables were nearly all of them unaccented
they must have been among the most difficult speech-sounds
to hear, and we are thus driven to one of these two conclu-
sions : either the Romans spoke with more precision and dis-
tinctness than any modern people, or else Latin could be
understood even though some of the inflectional syllables
failed to be heard.   Besides, the retention of " minimal " final
vowels before initial vowels would certainly not help much
in the understanding of the language.   If full syllables fre-
quently fail to reach the ear, certainly there would be small
likelihood that the auditor in the last row could distinguish
a vowel which the actor spoke so rapidly that it had no
metrical value whatever.[6]

12. For a detailed examination of the question of the
intelligibility of Latin poetry, if the elision be total loss of
the " elided " sounds, we have chosen the first 100 verses of
the *Aeneid*.   There are in the passage 54 elisions.   Fifteen
examples (5, 7, 14, 27, 30, 40, 43, 45, 57, 61, 65, 69, 78, 84, 98)
are elisions of the final vowel of -*que*; four are of the vowel
of -*ne* (11, 37, 39, 97); three are of the -*um* of the genitive
ending -*orum* (38, 51, 89); three are of the final -*e* of the
present infinitive (38, 63, 96); five are elisions of finals of
indeclinables which cannot be mistaken for anything else
(*necdum* 25, *praeterea* 49, *extemplo* 92, *ante* 95, *ubi* 99); one
is the nominative *Iuno* (36), which is perfectly clear; one is
the clipping of the initial of *est* (64; included here for con-

---

[6] We may cite the line from Horace, *Serm.* I, 9, 30,

        Quod puero cecinit divina mota anus urna,

and ask how any identification of *mōtā* as ablative singular could be made when
the final vowel was slurred : could the slurrer preserve both quality and quantity?
For here both elements are necessary for the apperception of the word, and the
loss of either will give a false meaning.   And again, when Vergil wrote *Aen.*
III, 658,

        Monstrum horrendum informe ingens, cui lumen ademptum,

the line conveys better the idea of the shapeless bulk of the Cyclops Polyphemus
if the words themselves suffer loss of their final sounds through elision and are
seemingly formless.

venience, despite the fact that it is hardly to be classed as elision). In these 32 examples out of the 54, no ambiguity arises; in the other instances there is always some neighboring word or phrase which serves to identify the form. Thus, a noun may be attended by an attributive or predicate adjective, and an adjective or participle may be attended by a noun which it modifies; these conditions account for ten (3, 13, 19, 22, 28, 32, 42, 44, 55, 98). In five instances the noun with elided ending is joined by "and" to another noun, which fixes the case (25, 30, 41, 58, 68). In two instances the noun is a genitive depending upon a near-by noun (40, 46); in two, the subject with elided ending is identified by the verb (35, 90); in one, the verb with elided ending is identified by the subject (48). All but two examples have been accounted for as certainly free from ambiguity, or reasonably so; these two are *multum* (3), and *una* (85), which the context renders at least reasonably free from uncertainty. Sometimes, of course, other factors also are present and render the identification still easier: no account has been taken above of the presence of prepositions (as in 41), or of the fact that objects are required for near-by verbs (as in 68); in one instance (30) the noun, besides being connected with another noun by an "and," is also evidently a genitive depending upon a preceding noun. In two instances only can there be any ambiguity: *causae* (25) might be *causa*, and *Argivom* (40) might be *Argivam*, though neither change would perceptibly alter the meaning of the passage.

Elision, if total loss, will produce no ill effects for the understanding of these lines. Precisely similar results are given by an examination of the 54 elisions in the 448 verses making up Horace, *Carm.* I, 1–16; but in Horace's lyrics the chance for ambiguity is diminished by the rarity of elision, as compared with the frequency of the phenomenon in the *Aeneid*.

13. It is not out of place to compare the testimony of the poetry of other languages, as to their practices in the matter of elision.

Greek poetry shows an abundance of elision; and that it was real loss, seems to be indicated by the omission of the

letters in writing, as well as by the practice of modern Greek poetry. Ancient Greek inscriptions show a considerable amount of omission of antevocalic final vowels.

Apropos of this, Latin inscriptions show very little omission of final vowels before vowels. An examination of those in Bücheler, *Carm. Lat. Epig.*, reveals only a few instances, in addition to the common clipping of *est*, as in *indiciost* (B. 58, 5 = *C.I.L.* I, 1012 = VI, 14328), *sitast* (B. 86, 1 = VI, 5254), *qualest* (B. 97, 4 = IX, 1164). There are a few examples, however : *hominesse* = *hŏminem esse* (B. 241 = IX, 3821), *cit acerba* = *cito acerba* (B. 1542, 8 = *Not. d. Scavi*, 1885, p. 496), *letifer hora* = *letifera hora* (B. 1141, 11 = III, 2964 ; unless *letifer* be here epicene), possibly *lustr e[t]* = *lustro et* (B. 797, 15 = *Not. d. Scavi*, 1888, p. 487) and *pietat inl* = *pietate inlustris* (B. 723, 2 = Huebner, *Insc. Hisp. Christ.* 124 ; though this may be mere abbreviation).

Positive statements are made by scholars familiar with Italian, that vowels are truly lost in the pronunciation of Italian poetry only if the loss is indicated in the writing, and that there is a vast amount of " slurring " in the singing of Italian. Other competent scholars insist that there is more real loss than is indicated in writing, and that the final vowel of *selva*, for example, is not slurred, but lost, in the second line of Dante's *Inferno* :

> Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita,
> Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura.

This raises the problem how we are to read *Inferno*, I, 37–38, which in a Milan edition of 1915 appears as

> Temp' era dal principio del mattino,
> È il sol montava 'n su con quelle stelle,

though, in a Florentine edition of 1897, we find *tempo* and *in* printed in full. This seems to indicate a difference in the practice, somewhat parallel to the modern practice of English-speaking actors on the stage, of rendering their parts, should they be metrical, in such a way as to disguise the fact that they are in verse ; while other persons may prefer to read

poetry as though it had rhythm.   In whichever way Italian verse is read or sung, there is a large amount of indubitable loss by elision.

The same is true of French poetry.   The elision of certain vowels of pronouns is familiar, and the *e muet* is lost before a vowel, though in ceremonial reading it is still sounded before a consonant and at the end of a line.   This indicates a period at which what is now the *e muet* was sounded before consonants and lost by elision before vowels.

In German poetry also, elision is found; an examination of the opening scene of Goethe's *Faust* reveals a considerable number of final vowels elided under varying circumstances.

The poems of Chaucer show a practice with respect to final unaccented *e* which is identical with that of French: it is sounded before a consonant and at the end of the line, and elided before a vowel.   English poetry shows a great deal of elision of final vowels, though it is no longer the custom to indicate the elision in printing, and it is usual nowadays to give the elided vowels almost their full value, to the detriment of the rhythm.

There is, therefore, abundant parallel testimony in other literatures for loss of final vowels by elision.   But as Latin verse is based on quantity and not on stress accent, the suppression of the elided syllable is even more imperatively demanded there than in Italian or German or English verse.

14. That, as a matter of fact, elided vowels were completely lost is shown by the following four considerations :

a. The assumption of a mere reduction of elided vowels leads to impossible conclusions.   If we suppose that such vowels became semivowels (Sommer, *l.c.*), they should make position.   In Vergil, *Georg.* II, 180,

> Tenuis ubi argilla et dumosis calculus arvis,

the first syllable of *tenuis* is long because the *u* is here treated as a semivowel; but the first syllable of *ubi* cannot be treated in the same way — it must remain short although the *i* of the following syllable is elided.

The alternative theory that a final vowel was slurred before

an initial vowel of the next word has, as we have seen, little in its favor.   It becomes quite grotesque when applied to such lines as Plautus, *Bacch.* 1162:

> Pol véro istá mala et tú nilí.   Quid múl*ta*?   *Ego amo.*
> *Án a*mas?   Ναὶ γάρ.

Here the sixth foot is a proceleusmatic, a foot whose four syllables have to be pronounced in the time of three morae, and it contains besides three elided vowels.   Will any one maintain that seven syllables were enunciated in the time normally occupied by three short syllables?   (Several similar lines may be found in Klotz, *Altrömische Metrik*, 355 ff.)

b.   In *Curc.* 691, Plautus puns on *cum catello ut accubes* and *cum catella ut accubes.*   Plautine puns, it is true, are not a very safe basis for phonetic argument; but this particular pun would be quite pointless if the final vowel of *catello* could be distinguished.

c.   The evidence of the stereotyped phrases seems quite conclusive.   Such forms as *animaequitas, antea, eccum, nullus, magnopere,* and *sodes* presuppose the complete loss of the final vowel of the first word.   The phrases *animadverto, cavaedium, circitor, curago, dominaedium,* and *veneo* are equally good proof that final *am* and *um* might be completely lost before an initial vowel belonging to the same phrase.   Further proof is presented by the incorrect separation of *animadverto* into *anima adverto* in *C.I.L.* ii, 5439, 3, 5, 7; 6278, 2; and x, 7852, 13 (cf. Diehl, *Neue Jahrbücher, Suppl.* xxv, 210); for if a trace of the original final *um* had remained, no one could have substituted *a* for *u.*

15.   *d.*   The ancient grammarians and metricians are quite unanimous in prescribing the suppression of elided vowels.   As a typical treatment of the matter we may cite Marius Plotius Sacerdos, vi, 448, K.:

> De synalifa.   Synalifa est quando finita pars orationis in vocalem vel in *m* litteram vel in *s*, altera parte orationis incipiente a vocali, eliditur, ut *mene efferre pedem* et *mene incepto.*   Sic in vocali.   In *m* littera *m* non sola perit in metro sed etiam vocalis quae eam antecedit, ut *monstrum horrendum ingens.*

The verb *perit* cannot denote anything short of complete loss, and we might rest our case upon this one passage. We nevertheless include some others.

If there is any virtue in repetition the strongest evidence is furnished by Pompeius (v, 298 K.):

> Sunt item alii duo metaplasmi inter se contrarii, ecthlipsis et synaliphe. . . . Ut puta, si vocalis vocalem excludat, synaliphe est, ut
>
> > Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena.

Ille ego : *e* et *e* duae istae vocales sunt, altera tamen alteram exclusit, et non fecit *ille ego*, sed fit *illego*. Dicitur synaliphe duarum concurrentium vocalium lubrica lenisque conlisio, quotiens duae sunt vocales et excludunt se leniter et lubrice. Haec synaliphe est. Illa vero non de vocalibus fit sed de consonantibus. Non enim ante potest excludi consonans, nisi pariter sit vocalis, quae excludat *m* litteram. Ut puta *hominem amicum :* ubi sustuleris myotacismum excluditur vocalis. Num vis scire ? Quotiens myotacismi ratio est, ut excludatur myotacismus, et vocalis excluditur, exclusa est consonans, ne sit myotacismus ; cum exclusus fuerit myotacismus, incipit vocalis excludi, ne sit hiatus. Necesse est ergo ita ut fiat, ut *m* excludas propter vitium, vocalem excludas propter illam litteram. Si enim non exclusa fuerit, incipit hiatus esse. Ergo tale erit illud :

> > Multille et terris.

Ita scandere habes. Ecce quae causa est ut non tantum *m*, sed et *u* excludas, quae *u* cum *m* littera est ; et appellatur ecthlipsis, id est consonantium aspere cum vocalibus concurrentium dura difficilisque conlisio.

Of particular significance is the contrast between the descriptions of episynalepha and of synalepha and ecthlipsis. The following four passages seem to derive from some common source :

> (1) Episynaliphe est una syllaba ex duabus syllabis facta, ut
>
> > Fixerit aeripedem cervam licet,

cum *aeripedem* quinque syllabis dicere debeamus. Synaliphe est duorum vocalium concursu alterius elisio, ut

> > Atque ea diversa penitus dum parte geruntur.

E litteram hinc necesse est excludi. Ecthlipsis est cum duabus dictionibus dure concurrentibus aliqua consonantium vel plures quaelibet eliduntur, ut

> Multum ille et terris iactatus et alto

pro *multum*. (Charisius, I, 279 K.)

(2) De synaliphe. Synaliphe est conlisio quae fit cum duarum inter se concurrentium vocalium altera eliditur, ut

> Adque ea diversa penitus dum parte geruntur.

Hic enim unum *e* praecedens excludi necesse est. Hinc a quibusdam syncrisis nominatur. De episynaliphe. Episynaliphe est conglutinatio seu contractio duarum syllabarum in unam syllabam, facta contraria synaliphe, ut

> Fixerit aeripedem cervam licet,

cum *aeripedem* quinque syllabas dicere debeamus. Ita fit una syllaba ex duabus. De ecthlipsi. Ecthlipsis est conlisio quaedam difficilis ac dura consonantium cum vocalibus aspere concurrentium ut est

> Multum ille et terris iactatus et alto. (Diomedes, I, 442 K.)

(3) Episynaliphe est una syllaba ex duabus facta, ut

> Fixerit aeripedem,

pro *aëripedem;* tetrasyllabon ex pentasyllabo fecit. Synaliphe est cum inter duo verba concursu duarum vocalium nulla intercedente consonante unius fit vocalis elisio, ut

> Atque ea diversa penitus.

. . . Ecthlipsis est cum inter se aspere concurrentium syllabarum intercedente sola *m* littera consonante et vocalem et consonantem quam diximus elidi necesse est, ut

> Multum ille et terris.
>
> (Ps.-Probus, *de Ultimis Syllabis*, IV, 263 f. K.)

(4) Episynaliphe est conglutinatio duarum syllabarum in unam, facta contraria diaeresi, ut *Phaethon* pro *Phaëthon*, *Nerei* pro *Nereï*, *aeripedem* pro *aëripedem*. Synaliphe est per interceptionem concurrentium vocalium lubrica quaedam lenisque conlisio, ut

> Atque ea diversa penitus dum parte geruntur.

Haec a quibusdam syncrisis nominatur.   Ecthlipsis est consonantium cum vocalibus aspere concurrentium quaedam difficilis ac dura conlisio, ut

      Multum ille et terris iactatus et alto.   (Donatus, IV, 396 K.)

Marius Victorinus (VI, 66 K.) substitutes the term συνεκφώ-νησις for *episynalepha*:

Nam συναλοιφή est, cum inter duas loquellas duarum vocalium concursus alteram elidit, id est cum duae partes orationis ita coeunt, ut altera in vocalem desinat et altera incipiat a vocali, ut

        Hic hasta Aeneae stabat,

item

        Priamique evertere gentem.

Nec tamen putaveris quamlibet de duabus eximi posse; illa enim quae supervenit priorem semper excludet, non prior sequentem. ἔκθλιψις autem vel ἔκτριψις fit, cum duae inter se dictiones dure concurrentes aliquam pluresve vocalium cum consonanti dumtaxat exprimunt, ut

      Multum ille et terris iactatus et alto,

item

      Circumdat nequiquam umeris et inutile ferrum.

συνεκφώνησις vero, cum duae vocales in unam syllabam coguntur, quae possunt duarum syllabarum locum divisae complere, nulla dumtaxat interposita consonante, ut cum *Phaethon* in metro sic enuntiatur, ut ex trisyllabo nomine disyllabum faciat . . .

The contrast which is drawn between synalepha and *syncope* by Marius Plotius Sacerdos (VI, 448 K.) is perhaps worth quoting:

Inter syncopen ergo et synalifam hoc est, quod syncope ab ipsis ponitur poetis, *nantes* pro *natantes;* synalifa autem a nobis vel pronuntiantibus vel pedes scandentibus fit, cum a poeta plenum verbum ponatur. *Mene incepto* nos scandimus *menincepto; monstrhor* nos percutimus, cum poeta posuerit *monstrum horrendum* . . .

This contrast, a slight one it must be confessed, is ignored by Priscian (III, 5 K.):

. . . quamvis reliquis quoque casibus vetustissimi addebant eandem *ce* syllabam : *hicce, huncce, hocce.*   Unde vocali quoque sequente ablata per synaloepham, manentibus duabus *c* solebant producere *hoc,* . . .

The teaching of the schools is faithfully reported by St. Jerome, *Ep.* xx, 5, 2 :[7]

. . . *osi anna*, sive, ut nos loquimur, *osanna*, media vocali littera elisa, sicuti facere solemus in versibus, quando *mene incepto desistere victam* scandimus *menincepto*.

Other passages in which the complete loss of elided vowels in verse is prescribed or assumed are Priscian, II, 364 K., Ps.-Probus, *de Ultimis Syllabis*, IV, 224 K., Consentius, V, 389 f., 400–404 K., Maximus Victorinus, VI, 210 f., 219, 221 K., Beda, VII, 246 K.

We should assume, in the absence of conflicting evidence, that a theory so unanimously accepted by the later grammarians represents a tradition from classical times. Fortunately, however, we are not left to a mere inference.

Quintilian, in the passage cited above (IX, 4, 36), says: Nam et coeuntes litterae, quae συναλοιφαί dicuntur, etiam leviorem faciunt orationem, quam si omnia verba suo fine cluduntur. If a word whose final vowel was elided did not come to a close at its end, the vowel must have been completely lost ; for the pronunciation *ill(e) et* (i.e. *illet*) pretty effectually obscures the word-end, while *ille et* with a "minimal vowel" would retain a syllable division at the end of the first word.

III

16. In the case of final *m* before an initial vowel Quintilian seems not to recognize elision, but only the pronunciation which we have found to be indicated by *circuire*, *queadmodum*, *cura ago*, etc. He discusses the matter as follows (IX, 4, 40):

Quotiens ⟨*m* littera⟩ ultima est et vocalem verbi sequentis ita contingit, ut in eam transire possit, etiamsi scribitur, tamen parum exprimitur, ut *multum ille* et *quantum erat;* adeo ut paene cuiusdam novae litterae sonum reddat. Neque enim eximitur sed obscuratur et tantum aliqua inter duas vocales velut nota est, ne ipsae coeant.

This passage must be interpreted in the light of some other ancient statements about final *m* before an initial vowel. Ve-

[7] For this citation we are indebted to Dr. T. A. Buenger, of the University of Pennsylvania.

lius Longus says (VII, 54 K.): Cum dicitur *illum ego* et
omnium optimum, illum et *omnium* aeque *m* terminat, nec tamen
in enuntiatione apparet.   More important, in view of its date,
is a remark which Velius Longus quotes (VII, 80 K.) from Ver-
rius Flaccus, the famous schoolmaster of the Augustan age :

Non nulli circa synaliphas quoque observandam talem scrip-
tionem existimaverunt, sicut Verrius Flaccus, ut ubicumque prima
vox *m* littera finiretur, sequens a vocali inciperet, *m* non tota, sed
pars illius prior tantum scriberetur, ut appareret exprimi non debere.

The last four words amount to an explicit statement that *m*
in such a position was not pronounced.   Quintilian's remark
can be squared with this only on the supposition that Quin-
tilian fails to discriminate clearly between pronunciation and
spelling — a failing of which many good scholars both ancient
and modern have been guilty.   We therefore interpret the
Quintilian passage thus :

" Whenever ⟨*m*⟩ is final and is so closely combined ⟨by the sense
of the passage⟩ with the ⟨initial⟩ vowel of the following word that it
can run over ⟨*i.e.*, be absorbed⟩ into the latter, it is written, to be
sure, but scarcely pronounced, as in *multum ille* and *quantum erat;*
and so we may almost say that it indicates the sound of a new letter
⟨*i.e.*, it does not represent the sound of *m*⟩.   For *m* is not taken out
⟨from the written text⟩, but is suppressed and is merely a sort of
mark between the two vowels to prevent their combining ⟨by
synalepha⟩."

The last two words of this interpretation are justified by
Quintilian's definition of *coeuntes litterae* in section 36 (quoted
above) and by a remark which occurs in XI, 3, 34: Nam et
vocales frequentissime coeunt, et consonantium quaedam in-
sequente vocali dissimulatur.   Utriusque exemplum posuimus
multum ille et terris. . . .   A comparison of these three pas-
sages seems to show that in Quintilian's opinion, while an
elided vowel was completely lost, a vowel which became final
on the loss of final *m* was pronounced.   As we have seen,
evidence furnished by the stereotyped phrases is opposed to
such a distinction ; for some of the phrases which have lost
a final *m* of the first word show complete elision while others
retain a vowel in hiatus, and the same variety of behavior is

found in the phrases with an original final vowel. There are, furthermore, no metrical phenomena which favor such a distinction as Quintilian seems to make; in fact, classical poetry avoids hiatus after *m* more carefully than after a vowel.

17. It seems probable, then, that while final *m* was regularly lost before an initial vowel in the same phrase, the vowel before the *m* was sometimes retained and sometimes lost. Quintilian preferred to retain it in all cases, at least when speaking in public, and he used the same pronunciation in reading verse. Such a practice must have interfered with the regularity of the meter, especially when a foot of too many syllables resulted, as would be the case in *Aeneid*, III, 643,

> Centu(m) alii curva haec habitant ad litora vulgo,

or where the following syllable was already extra heavy on account of containing a long vowel or diphthong followed by two consonants, as in *Aeneid*, III, 714,

> Hic labor extremus, longaru(m) haec meta viarum.

Probably Quintilian was the sort of person who would read English blank verse as if it were prose.

18. Another schoolmaster who seems to have read verse in the same way was Probus, if we may judge from Gellius' quotation (XIII, 21, 6) of a statement of his that *turrim in* (*Aeneid*, II, 460) had a more pleasant sound than *turrem in*.

IV

19. For the purpose of securing a general view of elision in Latin verse, portions of the main authors who wrote in the dactylic hexameter have been examined, and the results are presented in the following table. The authors are arranged in chronological order, as nearly as may be, and the portions of their works which have been examined are indicated. The average number of elisions per hundred verses is given in the fourth column; in arriving at this figure, instances of the enclisis (or whatever the phenomenon may really be) of *est* and of *es* have been included, but no account has been taken of elisions at the end of hypermetric verses, nor of semi-elision and hiatus.

The portions of the works examined are in some instances not very large, but in the preparation of the table it became apparent that examination of greater portions would not change the figures sufficiently to lead to any other conclusions than those which may be drawn from the present table.

AUTHOR	WORK EXAMINED	NUMBER OF VERSES	ELISIONS PER 100 VERSES	APPROXIMATE DATE
Ennius	*Annales*[8]	179	22	?–169 B.C.
Lucilius	*Satirae*[8]	253	133	132–107
Lucretius . . .	*De R. N.* I	800	48	?–55
Catullus . . .	Poems[9]	797	47	?–54
Vergil	*Eclogae*, 1–6	506	28	43–39
Vergil	*Georgica*, I	514	46	37–30
Horace	*Sermones*, I	1029	43	?–35
Horace	*Sermones*, II	1083	46	34–30
Vergil	*Aeneid*, I	756	48	29–19
Vergil	*Aeneid*, XII	953	56	29–19
Tibullus . . .	I[9]	405	14	31–27
Propertius . . .	I–II, 9[9]	525	24	27–24
Horace	*Epist.* I	1006	19	?–20
Horace	*Epist.* II	962	20	18–14?
Ovid	*Amores*, I–II[9]	796	17	20–15?
Ovid	*Metam.* I	779	22	?–8 A.D.
Ovid	*Tristia*, I–II[9]	658	20	8–12
Manilius . . .	*Astron.* I	926	28	Time of Tiberius
Persius	*Sat.* 1–6	650	52	?–62
Lucan	*Phars.* I	695	18	?–65
Calpurnius Sic. .	*Ecl.* 1–7	759	3	Time of Nero
Lucilius Junior .	*Aetna*	646	40	Before 79
Valerius Flac. .	*Arg.* I	851	29	79–?
Martial	*Epig.* XIII–XIV[9]	355	5	84–85
Statius	*Theb.* I	720	39	79–91
Silius Ital. . . .	*Pun.* I	694	42	?–100
Juvenal	*Sat.* 1–3	663	33	100–?
Nemesianus . .	*Ecl.* 8–11	339	11	250–300
Claudianus . . .	*Bell. Gild.*	526	3	*c.* 400
Claudianus . . .	*Rapt. Pros.*	1108	7	*c.* 400

[8] The figures cover all fragments amounting to two complete dactylic hexameter verses in Vahlen's 2d edition of Ennius and in Marx's edition of Lucilius.

[9] The figures cover the hexameter verses of the elegiac distichs.

20. Ennius, the first Roman poet to use the dactylic hexameter, made rather slight use of elision, though in the comedies of his contemporary Plautus and in those of Terence, writing a few years later, there are more than 150 instances per 100 lines (some of which are semi-elisions). From this it seems that elision was a phenomenon of the popular speech which did not find immediate acceptance to its fullest extent in the dignified style of the epic; but a few decades later, the satirist Lucilius admitted it to his writings almost as readily as did the dramatists, possibly because of the admittedly colloquial nature of his writings. Lucretius and Catullus show a position between Ennius and Lucilius, with about 50 per cent (we use this for brevity, to indicate instances per hundred verses), and Horace in his *Satires* has nearly as much. Vergil started with fewer elisions, but increased steadily in his use of it, until in the final book of the *Aeneid* he has 56 per cent. But about 30 B.C. there must have been a reaction against the excessive use of elision, for in Tibullus, Propertius, Horace's *Epistles*, and Ovid the percentage runs but from 14 to 24; yet this had no effect upon Vergil in the composition of the *Aeneid*. Possibly Vergil, as the representative of an older generation, resented the change, and persisted in the previous practice; though Horace followed the fashion of the times, reducing the amount of elision in his *Epistles* to less than half what it had been in his *Satires*. In the writers of the first century A.D., there is great variety: excepting those to be mentioned later, they run from 28 to 42 per cent, which is not a very great range. Of the epic poets, Lucan forms an exception with a percentage of 18, quite worthy of the best traditions of the Augustan Age; perhaps this should be noted as another mark of his superiority over other epic poets of his age. Persius, with an average of 52 per cent, is very erratic, since his separate *Satires* range from barely above 20 per cent to nearly 80 per cent; his youth may account for his lack of a settled standard. The *Eclogues* of Calpurnius Siculus are almost without elision, but Nemesianus has almost four times his percentage, despite the fact that he comes two centuries later. Juvenal stands midway

between the usage of Horace's *Satires* and that of the Augustan Age. Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* are almost free from elision, and there is likewise very little in the poems of Claudius Claudianus, writing about 400 A.D.

The purpose of this review is to show the inadequacy of the statement that elision was frequent in most of the early poets, but was regarded with increasing disfavor by writers of the Augustan and succeeding ages. Rather we must say that there was a sharp reaction against it at about 30 B.C., which did not affect Vergil; that the poets of the Silver Age in general have more than those of the Augustan Age; and that some poets, starting in the Silver Age, show a very small amount of elision.

21. For purposes of comparison of the elision in the hexameter verses with that in the so-called "pentameter" verses in the elegiac distich, the following table is presented:

AUTHOR	WORKS EXAMINED	NUMBER OF DISTICHS	ELISIONS PER 100 HEXAMETERS	ELISIONS PER 100 PENTAMETERS
Catullus . .	All the elegiacs	323	60	62
Tibullus . .	I	405	14	12
Propertius .	I–II, 9	525	24	19
Ovid	*Amores*, I	390	15	7
Ovid	*Amores*, II	406	18	13
Ovid	*Tristia*, I	369	19	7
Ovid	*Tristia*, II	289	20	11
Martial. . .	*Epig.* XIII–XIV	355	5 +	5 −

This shows the sharp falling off in elision in the elegiac poets in the Augustan Age; and an even further decrease in the Silver Age, which does not hold for the epic poets. After Catullus, with his enormous amount of elision, none of these poets has as much elision in the "pentameters" as in the hexameters, the difference being particularly evident in Ovid ; but this is as we might expect, since the pentameters are shorter than the hexameters, and naturally offer fewer opportunities for elision.

22. For the purpose of examining several items, the following table also has been prepared. The elisions in certain portions of certain authors have been tabulated in five groups: (1) elision of *e* in *-que*; (2) enclisis of *est* or *es*; (3) elision of a final vowel and *m*; (4) elision of other short vowels; (5) elision of long vowels and diphthongs. The table lists the authors and their works which were examined, with the number of verses examined and the number of elisions in those verses. Then the "relative frequency" table gives in five columns, headed by symbols which will identify the elided sounds, the percentage of every group to the total of elisions in that passage of the author. The "absolute frequency" table gives similarly the average number of lines of the author to one instance of this kind of elision. Thus the elision of *e* of *-que* forms 12 per cent of the elisions in Lucilius' *Satires*, and occurs once in every 6+ lines.

It is only fair to remark upon the difficulty of deciding as to the quantity of certain final vowels under the Empire, which might lead another to slightly (not greatly) different figures in some of the columns.

23. Several phenomena stand out in the table. The enclisis of *est* was disliked by Lucilius and by Vergil, but was frequent in the Augustan Age and for some time thereafter; but Lucan disliked it, and after his time it falls off tremendously. Only in Martial there is a large relative increase, and in Juvenal an approximation to the usage of Horace.

The elision of the *e* of *-que* was increasingly distasteful to Horace, and this dislike is shared by other elegiac poets, though not by Ovid in his narrative verse (*Metam.* 1). In later times, this elision of *e* in *-que* forms a very large percentage of the total, actually being 50 per cent in Lucan.

The elision of other short vowels has no prominent peculiarities. As to that of vowel and *m*, the treatment by the Roman grammarians (§§ 16–18 above) might make us think that it was looked on with disfavor; but such is far from being the case. Except in pastoral and elegiac verse, it never falls below 13 per cent of the total instances of elision, and rarely below 20 per cent. In whatever way it was actually dealt with

AUTHOR	WORKS EXAMINED	Vv.	ELISIONS	RELATIVE FREQUENCY					ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY				
				que	*est*	*-m*	)	-	*que*	*est*	*-m*	)	-
Lucilius	*Satirae*	253	337	12	4	27	30	27	6+	19+	3-	3-	2+
Lucretius	*De R. N.* 1	800	386	17	11	14	47	11	12+	20-	15-	4+	19-
Catullus	*Poems*	1120	578	11	13	25	25	26	18+	15-	8-	8-	7+
Vergil	*Aeneid,* 1	756	365	25	3	26	22	24	8+	69-	8-	9+	9-
Horace	*Serm.* 1	1029	438	11	13	29	29	18	21	17+	8+	8+	13+
Horace	*Epist.* 1	1006	197	5	15	35	33	12	100+	35-	15-	15+	44-
Tibullus	1	809	106	11	30	12	38	9	67+	29+	62+	20+	81-
Propertius	1-11, 9	1050	228	15	12	25	41	7	31-	45+	18+	11+	75
Ovid	*Amores,* I-II	1592	211	15	37	10	30	8	50-	20+	76-	25-	100-
Ovid	*Metam.* 1	779	175	37	26	13	21	3	12+	17-	34-	22-	130-
Ovid	*Tristia,* I-II	1316	183	24	43	6	24	3	31-	17-	110-	30-	263+
Persius	*Satirae*	650	339	10	10	21	42	17	19+	20-	9+	5-	12-
Lucan	*Phars.* 1	695	126	50	11	16	18	5	11+	50-	35-	32-	99+
Calp. Sic.	*Ecl.* 1-7	759	21	24	19	5	38	14	152-	190-	759	95-	253
Val. Flac.	*Arg.* 1	851	244	32	1	23	33	11	11-	284-	15+	10+	33-
Martial	*Epig.* XIII-XIV	710	35	17	54	9	20	0	118+	37+	237-	101+	…
Statius	*Theb.* 1	720	281	28	2	29	30	11	9+	120	9-	9-	24
Silius Ital.	*Pun.* 1	694	293	26	2	26	33	13	9+	139-	9+	7+	18-
Juvenal	*Sat.* 1-3	663	216	14	11	39	27	9	25+	29+	9-	8+	60+
Nemesianus	*Ecl.* 8-11	339	38	55	5	0	37	3	16+	170-	…	24+	339
Claudianus	*Bell. Gild.*	528	16	62	0	25	13	0	53-	…	131+	263	…
Claudianus	*Rapt. Pros.*	1108	73	44	1	19	32	4	35-	1108	79+	48+	369+

in reading, it evidently did not produce results disagreeable to the ear.

The elision of long vowels and diphthongs follows the general trend of elision, but more pronouncedly. The decrease in the Augustan Age is relative as well as absolute, and the increase in the Silver Poets is also relative as well as absolute; but Lucan abides by the standard of the Augustan Age.

It is interesting to note that Catullus and Horace's *Satires*, I, agree very closely, both relatively and absolutely; that there is nearly as close an agreement between Tibullus and Ovid's *Amores*; and that there is a still closer agreement among Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Silius Italicus.

24. It is often stated that long vowels suffer elision but rarely before a short (so Lane-Morgan, *Lat. Gram.*[2] § 2483); but this is either misstated or wrong. If the statement mean "before a short vowel," it is quite contrary to the facts; and the form of the statement can hardly mean "before a short syllable," which would be fairly accurate. The following table will illustrate this point, giving the amount of elision of the sounds (as already classified) before short vowels of short syllables, before short vowels in syllables long by position, and before long vowels and diphthongs, in Vergil's *Aeneid*, I, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, I. Similar statistics for the elided long vowels and diphthongs only, are appended for several other writers.

	INITIALS BEFORE WHICH ELISION OCCURS		
	SHORT VOWEL OF OPEN SYLLABLE	SHORT VOWEL OF LONG SYLLABLE	LONG VOWEL OR DIPHTHONG
Verg. *Aen.* I			
Elision of *e* in *-que* .	20	51	20
Elision of vowel and *m*	7	67	23
Elision of other short vowels	19	45	16
Elision of long vowels and diphthongs	5	58	23

	SHORT VOWEL OF OPEN SYLLABLE	SHORT VOWEL OF LONG SYLLABLE	LONG VOWEL OR DIPHTHONG
Ovid, *Metam.* I			
Elision of *e* in *-que* .	27	31	6
Elision of vowel and *m*	2	19	2
Elision of other short vowels ⟶ . . .	16	13	7
Elision of long vowels and diphthongs	0	6	0
Elision of long vowels and diphthongs in Catullus, 1120 vv.	13	104	33
in Lucan, I . . .	0	7	0
in Valerius Flaccus, I	4	18	4
in Silius Italicus, I .	0	37	2
in Juvenal, I–3 . .	1	10	0

This shows that the greatest amount of all elision, including that of long vowels and diphthongs, occurs before short vowels in syllables long by position.

25. One might wonder whether there is any tendency in favor of elision before initials of like quality to the sounds elided. But that there is absolutely no such tendency appears from this table:

	ELISION BEFORE SOUNDS OF	
	LIKE QUALITY	UNLIKE QUALITY
Vergil, *Aeneid*, I		
Elision of *e* in *-que*	12	79
Elision of vowel and *m* . . .	9	88
Elision of other short vowels .	21	59
Elision of long vowels and diphthongs	10	76
Ovid, *Metam.* I		
Elision of *e* in *-que*	15	49
Elision of vowel and *m* . . .	4	19
Elision of other short vowels .	9	27
Elision of long vowels and diphthongs	2	4

V

26. Our conclusions, then, are these :

a. In Latin prose, elision occurred only within the limits of a phrase, and not always even there.

b. In case of elision, there was complete loss of the final vowel or of final *m* and the vowel before it. This method of pronunciation came to be the regular one in poetry, although hiatus was never fully banished from verse.

c. In the first century A.D., certain scholars preferred hiatus in all cases where a final *m* was lost before a vowel ; but the technique of the poets took no account of this fad.

d. Elision in Latin verse decreased suddenly and violently about 30 B.C., but increased again in most of the Silver Poets, and declined again still later to a very low point.

e. There was never any special prejudice among the poets against the elision of a final *m* and of the vowel before it.

f. Most elision occurs before short initial vowels of syllables long by position.

g. There is no preference for elision before vowels of like quality.